

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending of which claims 1-9 and 13-20 stand rejected and claims 10-12, 21, and 22 stand objected to. Claims 1, 7, 8, 13, and 17 are amended by way of this amendment to clarify the subject matter of the invention and/or to correct obvious typographical errors. All pending claims, as amended, are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lee.

However, independent claim 1 is amended to generally recite that the spacers are configured to *space* a first electronics component (to be mounted to the first mounting structure) *from an electronics base*. Independent claim 1 is also amended to generally recite that the first mounting structure is configured to be attached to the electronics base. Independent claim 13 is amended to generally recited that the spacing means is configured to *space* the first electronics component to be mounted on the component mounting means from the electronics base, the component mounting means being configured to be attached to the electronics base.

In contrast, Lee's fastening plate 5 does not provide spacers configured to space the electronics component to the electronics base. Instead, Lee's fastening plate 5 is configured so that the electronics component (the read-write device 2) is positioned against the interior side of the electronics base (the housing 2).

In particular, Lee's fastening plate 5 provides bent ends 51 and fastening ends 52 extending from each bent end 51. The bent end 51 is configured to *space the fastening plate 5 from the housing 1* at a distance similar to that of the bulging block 3 so that the fastening ends 52 extending from the bent ends 51 extend into the housing 2 and into the threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2, as shown in FIGS. 1-4 (see also col. 2, lines 9-20). Thus Lee's fastening system is configured to position the read-write device 2 *against (and not spaced from, as generally recited in the claims)* the other side of the wall of the housing 2 from the fastening plate 5.

For example, Lee states that “A screw 6 is used to pass through a central hole 53 of the fastening plate 5 into the threaded hole 31 of the bulging block 3, *so that the disk drive may move to lie against the other side* and hence effectively position the read-write device, as shown in FIG. 3.” (Col. 2, lines 15-19, emphasis added; see also FIG. 3). In other words, the disk drive (read-write device) 2 is secured against the interior side of the housing 1, e.g., via the fastening ends 52 of the fastening plate 5 that engage the positioning threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2.

Thus Lee’s fastening plate 5 does not disclose or suggest spacing the first electronics component (i.e., Lee’s read-write device 2) from the electronics base (i.e., Lee’s housing 1) as generally recited in the amended claims. As such, Lee fails to disclose or suggest the inventions of independent claims 1 and 13 as amended.

With respect to dependent claim 3 which generally recites that the electronics component mounting system further includes a fastening mechanism to secure the first mounting structure to the first electronics component, the Examiner contends that the screw 6 secures the first mounting structure to the first electronics component. However, as shown in FIGS. 3 and 4 of Lee, the screw 6 merely attaches the fastening plate 5 to the bulging block 3 of the housing 2 and the screw 6 does not extend beyond the bulging block 3 to engage the read-write device 2. Rather, Lee utilizes the fastening ends 52 to engage the positioning threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2. Thus Lee also does not disclose or suggest the additional limitation of dependent claim 3.

With respect to dependent claim 6 which generally recites that the supports are made of a material that is harder than the material of the holes of the electronics component, the Examiner contends that Lee shows such a feature in FIGS. 1-4, element 52. However, Lee merely illustrates and discloses that the fastening ends 52 engage the positioning threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2 and does not disclose or suggest that the fastening ends 52 is made of a material that is harder than the material of the positioning threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2, as generally recited in dependent claim 6. Thus Lee also does not disclose or suggest the additional limitation of dependent claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 as well as claims 3, 5-7, 14 and 15 dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 4, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of various secondary references. However, dependent claims 2, 4, 8, and 9 are believed to be allowable at least because independent claim 1 from which they depend are allowable as discussed above.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claim 8, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to integrally form the fastening plate 5 with the housing 1 in Lee. However, Lee's system is such that the read-write device 2 must *first* slide into the space 11 within the housing 2 along slide rails 12 at the edges of the space 11, and *then* the two fastening ends 52 of the fastening plate 5 are passed into the positioning threaded holes 21 of the read-write device 2. (See col. 2, lines 11-15). If the fastening plate 5 (along with its two fastening ends 52) were integrally formed with the housing 2, the two fastening ends 52 would protrude into the space 11 within the housing that is to be occupied by the read-write device 2 such that the two fastening ends 52 would block the read-write device 2 from sliding into the space 11 within the housing 2. As Lee's system would not function as intended if the fastening plate 5 and the housing 1 were integrally formed, Lee actually *teaches away* from integrally forming the fastening plate 5 with the housing 2 and thus does not render dependent claim 8 obvious.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 17-20, the Examiner states that the methods of claims 17-20 are deemed as being inherent in the assembly of the claimed apparatus since the elements recites are taught and suggested in the prior art of record.

However, independent claim 17 is amended to also recite that the spacers are configured to space the first electronics component (to be mounted to the first mounting structure) from an electronics base and that the first mounting structure is configured to be attached to the electronics base. Thus, independent claim 17 as well as claims 18-20 dependent therefrom, are

believed to be similarly allowable as discussed above with reference to independent claims 1 and 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-1217 (Order No. GOOGP007).

Respectfully submitted,



Jung-hua Kuo
Reg. No. 41,918
P.O. Box 3275
Los Altos, CA 94024
Telephone: (650) 988-8070
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090